

UNITED WISDOM

Turning a Vague Experience Into a Question You Can Work With

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I50 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Turning a Vague Experience Into a Question You Can Work With

Epigraph

> *“Divide each of the difficulties.” — René Descartes, Discourse on the Method, Part II. Short fragment from John Veitch’s English translation, display capitalisation only. A methodological perspective, not a requirement to turn an entire personal life into tasks.*

What this article is about

After a conversation, an indefinite discomfort remains. Nothing obviously bad seems to have happened, yet you want to return to what was said, change your reply or understand why the evening no longer feels calm. The first question that comes to mind is often too large: what is wrong with me? It addresses the entire person and gives no indication of what information might help. You can search for an answer for a long time without approaching a particular event. Another beginning is sometimes enough: what remains unclear in this conversation, and why do I want to clarify it now? This shift promises no immediate change in feeling, but makes the subject of examination more distinguishable.

Imagine a fictional episode. A relative asks Ilya to help with a move at the weekend. Ilya says he will think about it, then feels a vague heaviness after the call. He tries to understand why helping loved ones is difficult, though he does not yet know how much time is required, what help is needed or which day is intended. Several things may meet in the experience: wanting to support someone, fatigue, personal plans and an unclear request. The feeling alone establishes no single cause. For a first step, Ilya need not uncover the entire history of the relationship. He can clarify the question actually facing him before replying.

A workable question has a bounded subject, an understandable unknown and a connection with a purpose. This is an editorial distinction, not a diagnostic instrument or a duty to turn every feeling into research. Sometimes rest, support, help or protection comes first. Sometimes an experience can simply remain unexplained. If you want to examine it, choosing a small part can help: in which episode did the difficulty arise, what is known and what would you like to learn? This article offers that approach without demanding a final emotional label, one deep cause or calm achieved through correct wording.

I. Not every experience requires a question

Before refining a task, notice whether you currently have the capacity and wish to examine it. Fatigue after a long day, insufficient sleep or a need for someone's presence need not require further analysis. You can rest first, say that you need a conversation or do something necessary. This is no failure of self-examination. A question helps when it matches a current purpose and available capacity, rather than testing whether you take yourself seriously. If you feel obliged to explain everything again, that demand can also be considered. The right to care does not depend on the precision of a cause you discover.

Ilya may find that he is too tired after the call to reflect and wants to return to the request tomorrow. His first decision then concerns the timing of a reply rather than the inner structure of his personality. He can tell his relative when discussing details will be possible, if that fits their agreement. A profound question need not be formulated yet. Postponement, however, does not mean indefinitely avoiding a necessary decision. There is a real time by which the other person needs an answer. It can be considered directly without turning tiredness into a moral deficiency or promising that rest will remove every discomfort connected with the conversation.

When urgent help or protection is needed, searching for wording should not delay an available necessary action. A person need not establish the origin of their state before seeking support. Even in an ordinary situation, several goals can be distinguished: I need someone beside me; I need to clarify circumstances; I need to decide how to reply. These goals can combine without automatically replacing one another. A supportive conversation need not resolve every unknown at once. An informational clarification does not guarantee emotional relief. A clearer immediate purpose places fewer demands on one question and makes a suitable next step easier to choose.

II. Locate the part where difficulty arose

A vague experience often describes an overall atmosphere, while a question needs a subject. You can cautiously turn to one episode: before a reply, after a particular request, when a topic changed or while imagining a future action. Everything need not be reconstructed in detail. Sometimes it is enough to say that heaviness became noticeable after discussing the weekend. This is not yet a cause or evidence that the other person did something wrong. It is a chosen boundary for examination. It prevents the whole day, a relationship and a view of yourself from automatically becoming one indivisible knot. A small part makes an unknown available for clarification easier to identify.

In chapter VI of *How We Think*, John Dewey distinguishes a felt difficulty from the work of defining it. In the selected passages, these moments may coincide or initially remain separate:

indefinite uneasiness is not yet a clearly established problem. This is historical philosophical and educational reasoning rather than a verified therapeutic procedure. Its limited relevance here is that the subject can be clarified before a solution is sought. Dewey's examples of scientific and everyday reflection do not become a compulsory exercise set, and his medical example is no invitation to diagnose yourself.

Ilya selects not the entire subject of helping relatives but the moment after a request to which he has not given a final answer. What happened can now be distinguished from the emerging question. Help was proposed; its extent and timing remain unspecified; his weekend plans matter too. Perhaps it will later become clear that the difficulty concerns the relationship or anticipated judgment. These hypotheses need not be asserted beforehand. Selecting an episode keeps examination close to available information. It allows a wider conversation if grounds and desire emerge, without requiring the largest possible explanation as a starting point.

III. Narrow a question without devaluing experience

A large question may express a significant concern. Why do I constantly live by others' expectations? How can I know what I want? Why does helping loved ones feel uncomfortable? These questions need not be declared wrong. In one evening, however, they may supply no distinguishable next step. The broad question can remain while a part concerning the present episode is placed beside it. What do I consider already promised in this conversation? Which plans am I trying to accommodate? What amount of help can I discuss? Narrowing the subject does not mean the concern is trivial. It makes available a part where something particular can be learned.

In Part II of *Discourse on the Method*, Descartes proposes examining difficulties through division and order. The selected passage belongs to his philosophical pursuit of certain knowledge and establishes no proof that every human experience can be solved like a geometrical problem. The limited comparison here concerns distinguishing several questions from one undifferentiated whole. Personal experience is not thereby reduced to parts without remainder. A circumstance of a request can become clearer while a complex relationship to it remains. The methodological perspective helps choose an order of examination without promising complete certainty about your life.

It helps to narrow a question by its subject rather than diminish the person's importance. Instead of demanding an explanation of your entire unreliability, ask why naming an available period of time is difficult in this conversation. More specifically, what prevents naming it now: an unclear request, uncertain personal plans or something else? The question need not receive an immediate answer. It reveals possible unknowns and permits clarification. If instead you ask why you are behaving badly again, an assessment is already built into the premise. Work

begins by reconsidering that premise: what particular action occurred, and what about it remains unclear?

IV. Name an unknown separately from a hypothesis

A question sometimes conceals an answer already chosen. Why am I afraid to refuse, when only discomfort after a request has been established? Why am I being forced to help, when expectations have not been discussed? Such wording may express an important hypothesis but should not quietly present it as fact. The hypothesis can sit beside a question: I suppose I fear refusing; I want to understand what I promised and what is expected. This does not require deleting the supposition. It preserves the possibility of checking its fit with the episode and noticing unspecified circumstances that may have been overlooked.

An unknown may concern an external fact, a personal intention, a decision criterion or a connection between events. These subjects need different forms of examination. The timing and extent of help can be clarified with the relative. Personal availability can be checked against plans. Why a particular feeling arose may remain unclear longer and need another conversation. One answer should not be expected to clarify every subject at once. The move’s exact timing provides useful information but does not demonstrate how much Ilya values loved ones. Distinguishing an unknown limits a conclusion and helps identify a source that can actually inform the question asked.

Sometimes an unknown cannot yet be named precisely. A more modest beginning is possible: which part of the situation can I not yet describe? This leaves room for observation without demanding an immediate causal theory. Perhaps the person notices that a request and an assumed obligation have merged, or that they do not know what they want from the conversation. Perhaps nothing clear emerges. The question can remain at that level, or a suitable person can be approached. Wording need not be perfect to serve as a beginning. It can change as material appears without making the first account a permanent commitment to one explanation.

V. What is the answer for?

A question becomes more definite when its answer’s purpose is known. Ilya may need to arrange help, understand his relationship to the request or prepare a discussion about weekend availability. All three purposes are acceptable but require different scopes of examination. Arranging help may require only the timing and particular task. A wider conversation needs other material. Without a named purpose, an answer may continually seem insufficient: details have arrived but calm has not; a feeling has been named but no decision made. This does not necessarily indicate a bad question. Several tasks may have been assigned to it, some of which need separate attention.

A purpose can be small: discovering which clarification is needed before replying. It need not include removing every unpleasant feeling. A person can make a clear decision and still feel sadness, tension or a mixed response to the consequences. Distinguishing information quality from a desired state is therefore useful. Was the needed detail obtained? Did understanding of the available choice change? These questions do not dismiss emotion. They simply avoid treating the absence of immediate relief as proof that all the work was useless. Emotional support retains a separate place when needed and may be wanted alongside clarification.

If the purpose becomes proving that you are a good person, any everyday answer may fail under that scale. The demand can be noticed without assigning a single request the task of settling your worth. Ilya can consider both a possibility of helping and his limitations. His decision concerns particular conditions rather than having to become final evidence of love or unreliability. Naming a purpose reveals this substitution. Instead of seeking justification for an entire personality, an available task remains: learn the conditions and choose a reply consistent with actual capacity. A wider personal conversation can happen later if it is needed.

VI. Where can suitable material be found?

Different questions lead to different sources. A personal note about plans supplies one thing, clarification from an event’s participant another and professional consultation a third. A general article may offer a concept but does not know the agreement between Ilya and his relative. Someone else’s example may recall similar experience but cannot establish the cause of his feeling. Ask what material could actually change your understanding of the selected unknown. Maximum information need not be collected. Sometimes one clarification is enough. Sometimes little material is available and a confident conclusion is currently impossible. That limit is also a substantive result of examination.

Proverbs20:5 compares inner counsel with something requiring understanding to draw out and express. This is a religious wisdom image rather than a contemporary theory of access to hidden motives. The selected verse and nearby context in the WEB translation were read here.

Its limited relevance is attentive clarification without certainty that someone can infallibly read another person. The comparison authorises neither compelled disclosure nor testing a loved one. A person can say as much as serves an agreed conversation while keeping part of their experience private.

Ways of obtaining material can be bounded beforehand. Do not test a relative through silence, create conflict for observation, break necessary agreements or collect others' personal information without a basis. A straightforward question about the amount of help needs direct clarification. A personal relationship to the request can be considered privately in words or discussed with a willing person. When medical, legal or other specialist decisions are involved, a general editorial approach replaces no suitable professional work. A question should remain proportionate to a safe way of examining it. Missing data is no invitation to obtain it at a cost you did not choose.

VII. What could change understanding?

Before the next step, consider which answer would actually change something. If help takes one hour, Ilya may view it differently from an entire day. Heavy physical work is a different task from packing light objects. This is not a proposal to test capacity through risk: substantial limitations are considered before acting. Different conditions show that the question has consequences for a real choice. If no possible clarification changes the initial verdict, notice whether the question has become a way of confirming an assessment already made. Examination allows at least the possibility of revising understanding in response to material received.

It is not always possible to anticipate every answer. One understandable distinction or sign of partial clarification is enough. I learned the timing but the extent remains unclear; I identified my available period but have not communicated it; I noticed that I demand a promise of complete calm from the answer. These outcomes differ, but each clarifies the next subject. Avoid combining them into a general conclusion that everything is understood or nothing worked. A small criterion reveals progress without artificial precision. It concerns the question rather than measuring every ability or the quality of a person's inner life.

A question should also allow an unwelcome answer. If clarified conditions do not fit, they can be acknowledged and another option discussed rather than reinterpreted to secure agreement. If the cause of an experience remains unknown, its boundary can stay. If conflicting wishes emerge, they may become another question without needing to disappear immediately. Working with a question guarantees no convenient result. It helps distinguish material, conclusion and available decision. Sometimes clarity means acknowledging that a request cannot currently be met under the proposed conditions, even while a wish to support the person remains real and significant.

VIII. The next question may be different

After clarification, an initial difficulty sometimes changes. Ilya has learned the timing and extent, compared them with his plans and can now reply. Another concern remains: how can he state the available option without promising more? This is a new subject, though connected with the earlier one. The first question need not be declared useless because another appears. One clarification made another task accessible. The chain need not continue indefinitely either. You can decide which question is needed now for an agreed reply and which can wait. Sequence follows the actual purpose rather than a demand to examine every possible connection.

A changed question may also reveal that the original subject was misplaced. Someone thought information was lacking but discovers that support with a difficult decision is most needed. That transition can be acknowledged and another kind of conversation chosen. It is not an error to conceal for the sake of a correct method. Wording develops alongside understanding of the situation. A new question, however, need not automatically become costlier or broader: clarifying a condition does not require moving into an entire family history. A person can retain a small scale and boundaries of disclosure, particularly when a wider conversation is currently unavailable or unwanted.

The article’s philosophical perspectives likewise establish no single ladder of compulsory stages. Cartesian order, Dewey’s examination of difficulty and the biblical image of understanding belong to different contexts. They reveal particular aspects of questioning without combining into a proven therapeutic programme. Every perspective need not be followed to formulate an ordinary clarification. Use a distinction that helps now while preserving its limit. Similar words about clarity do not make the underlying projects identical or promise that every experience will inevitably become unambiguous after reflection in the correct order.

IX. A voluntary trial of one clarification

If you want to try the approach, choose an ordinary, safe episode where clarification is wanted and no urgent specialist decision is necessary. First, name the nearest purpose: support, clarification of a circumstance or selection of an available action. Then choose one part of the event and one unknown. This can happen mentally, in a brief private note or with a willing conversation partner. A precise emotional label or complete causal explanation is unnecessary. If rest or help is the main need now, the trial need not begin. It should create no further obligation to understand everything before receiving care.

Try expressing the question so that information capable of helping is identifiable. Ilya might ask what amount of help and what timing he needs to clarify before replying. A hypothesis about

fear of refusal can remain beside it without becoming an established cause. The next safe step is asking for details and checking personal availability. This is one situation’s example rather than a universal template for every experience. Another person can choose a different subject or decline examination. Any personal note remains private and requires no names, publication or tests of another participant. The trial can be stopped at any time.

After clarification, naming what changed and what remains unknown is enough. Perhaps replying has become possible while the emotional response remains mixed. Perhaps another question is needed. Perhaps a conversation about support now matters more. A positive outcome need not be obtained, and reflection need not continue until complete calm arrives. If examination increases unpleasant tension and stops helping, it can end, with suitable help discussed when needed. This is an editorial trial concerning one question rather than a verified clinical method. Its result establishes neither a diagnosis nor a person’s worth or the quality of an entire relationship.

X. A clear question preserves the answer’s limits

Formulating a question means naming both the knowledge wanted and the limit of what follows from an answer. Clarifying the extent of help does not reveal a relative’s hidden motive. Personal availability does not establish a measure of love. Naming an experience does not identify its sole cause. When these boundaries are visible, a small answer can be sufficient for its task. It need not explain an entire personality and every relationship. This preserves precision and allows another unknown to be acknowledged separately without devaluing information already received. A clear question lets an answer remain proportionate to what was actually asked.

Complete certainty is no compulsory ending. A partial answer can arrive, a safe action be chosen or unavailable material acknowledged. Further examination can be declined in favour of ordinary activity. Such a limit should not be declared evidence of being unable to understand yourself. Sometimes it reflects real conditions, available time or the character of an unknown. When a question matters and is difficult to manage alone, a suitable person may help clarify its subject. Help requires no flawless wording prepared in advance. The difficulty can be described approximately, with a conversation beginning from the support wanted now.

Ilya may remain someone who dislikes refusing and nevertheless answer a particular request more clearly. He learned the conditions, named an available option and noticed which wider question remains unresolved. This is no final victory over feeling but a small result of working with one episode. Instead of a general demand to explain what is wrong with him, a connection among situation, unknown and purpose appeared. The next question can be chosen more freely because the first answer need not finish his entire inner history. Experience retains the

right to be complex, and a person can work with an available part without making their whole self a problem.

What this means in practice

First decide whether a question is wanted now or whether rest, support and necessary help come first. If you want to examine experience, choose one safe episode. Name known information, a hypothesis and an unknown separately. Clarify the answer’s purpose: what understanding or available action should it support? Then ask what material could actually change your view of that unknown and how it can be obtained safely. A question can be narrowed without devaluing an experience’s importance. It may remain approximate, change shape or be postponed while respecting actual agreements.

After the next step, distinguish information received from what remains unclear. An everyday clarification need not establish personal worth, measure love or guarantee calm. The personal trial is voluntary and private, involving no risk, hidden tests of others or abandonment of needed support. It can be stopped. Important specialist decisions require suitable professional consideration. A sufficient outcome is a more precise question, a partial answer or a visible limit of material. Work becomes possible when the subject fits the purpose and a person retains the right not to make every feeling a compulsory task.

Key quotation

> *“Deep water.” — Proverbs20:5, short fragment from the World English Bible, display capitalisation only. The image concerns wise clarification of inner counsel rather than infallible reading of another person’s motives.*

Connections between traditions

• **Descartes, Part II:** dividing a difficulty and ordering examination; a limited methodological perspective without reducing all personal life to deduction.

• **Dewey, chapter VI:** felt difficulty differs from its definition; historical philosophical and educational reasoning, not a clinical protocol.

• **Proverbs20:5:** a religious image of understanding and expressing inner counsel. Neither a right to compelled disclosure nor a theory of infallible knowledge of another person’s inner world.

• **Editorial question:** an episode, unknown, purpose and available material. Comparison does not establish a single doctrine or verified effectiveness of a personal trial.

Sources

1. René Descartes. *Discourse on the Method*, Part II, selected four rules. John Veitch, translator. Project Gutenberg59. Selected rules, nearby context and metadata were read, not the entire work. This translation's specific printed edition date was not established. A global digital-edition licence was not established; source text is neither imported nor vectorised.

2. John Dewey. *How We Think*, chapter VI, selected opening and definition of difficulty. D.C.Heath,1910. Project Gutenberg37423. Selected passages were read, with everyday and scientific examples distinguished; not the whole chapter or book. The medical example is not used for self-diagnosis. Digital-edition rights UNKNOWN; source text is neither imported nor vectorised; this article contains no direct Dewey quotation.

3. *Proverbs20:5*, World English Bible, nearby context20:3–7. Official WEB page. Verse and context were read, with the full short chapter returned; not the entire book. The publisher expressly declares the English text public domain. The short editorial Russian rendering is not a branded Russian WEB edition. Punitive chapter imagery is not adopted as a practice; source text is neither imported nor vectorised.

Tags

experience, vagueness, question, clarification, unknown, hypothesis, episode, context, purpose, answer, material, information, choice, action, support, rest, help, boundaries, wording, clarity, uncertainty, partial answer, order, examination, voluntary practice, self-observation, self-examination, Descartes, Dewey, Proverbs, relationships, proportion

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.